

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 and 4-8 are amended. The amendments add no new subject matter as support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in at least paragraph 7 of the specification. Claims 2, 3 and 10-30 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in these claims. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3 and 10-30 are canceled as being drawn to a non-elected group of claims and/or species.

The Office Action, on page 2, indicates that claims 4-8 recite allowable subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action states that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate this indication of allowability but respectfully submit that independent claim 1 from which these claims depend is allowable for at least the reasons indicated below.

The Office Action, on page 2, objects to claims 4-8 for informalities. Claims 4-8 are amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 4-8 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,143,366 to Lu (hereinafter "Lu"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Lu discloses a high pressure process for crystallization of ceramic films at low temperatures. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Lu teaches a complex oxide raw material is crystallized using a heat treatment, a pressure above 2 atm and an oxygen volume of 10% or less. The Examiner concedes that the example cited in the Office Action utilizes ammonia vapor, which is 0% oxygen. Lu does not teach crystallizing a raw material including a


complex oxide by subjecting the raw material to a heat treatment in an atmosphere pressurized to two atmospheres or more and containing oxygen at a volume ratio greater than or equal to 1% but less than or equal to 10%, as positively recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reason, Lu cannot reasonably be considered to teach all of the features in independent claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lu are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 1, in addition to the indicated allowable subject matter of claims 4-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/brc

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--